

LIVERPOOL CLASSICAL MONTHLY

ISSN 0309-3700

Vol. 13 No 7 July 1988

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
by Dr J. Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,
RATES for 1988, 10 issues (not August and September)
SURFACE £8.50 UK, £9.50 Europe, \$(US)17.50 elsewhere
AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.



CONTENTS, of which the authors retain the copyright	
A. James Cullens (Otago): <i>A recalculation of the number of grain recipients in the late Republic</i>	98-99
Sarah Donaldson (St Andrews): <i>'Direness' and its place in the Aeneid</i>	100-101
G. B. A. Fletcher (Newcastle): <i>Siliana</i>	101-105
Niall W. Slater (The Center for Hellenic Studies): <i>The τειχίον of Ecclesiastes 497</i>	105
Dana Ferrin Sutton (U. Cal. Irvine): <i>Dicaeopolis as Aristophanes, Aristophanes as Dicaeopolis</i>	105-108
Review: F. W. Walbank (Peterhouse, Cambridge)	108-112
Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (edd.), <i>Hellenism in the East: the interaction of Greek and non-Greek civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander</i> , London, Duckworth, 1987. Pp.xvi + 192; 14 plates, 1 map, 12 figs. Cloth, £28.00. ISBN 07-156-21254	

The Editor had anyway intended, in 'this number of *LCM*' to temper the implied criticisms of CUCD in the last number by praise of its suggested reply to the UGC Proposed Research Selectivity Exercise, which it does not think should be carried out, and in particular of its recognition of the fact that Classics research is individual and, compared with much scientific research, inexpensive, its rejection of 'bibliometric techniques' and of the criteria of grants. All this is, of course, an attempt to apply to research in the humanities techniques which may (or may not) be appropriate to the sciences.

However, his remarks produced a response from the Chairman (who thinks that "President" 'sounds a bit despotic') asking for readers to be referred to *CUCD Bulletin* 16 (1987), 40-42, 'for a reminder of what CUCD was set up to do.' The Editor wants to steer a course between boring overseas readers with what is essentially a domestic concern and the desire both to provide an open forum for the discussion of what are real differences and to keep them informed of how things are here as he reiterates his invitation to them to tell him, in a form suitable for publication, how it is with them.

As to which, resuming once more the Collingwoodian plumage of an academic goose, the Editor will once more cackle, and say how he thinks the Capitol may be saved from those who might be better described as Goths, Vandals or Philistines. Which is by getting on with Classics: by teaching as best we can what we can to the sort of students we are and will be getting (and we need to think seriously about what sort they are and how we may teach them what) and by publishing the research we want to do, instead of joining in the team-project game which is not appropriate to our discipline except for *thesauri* and *corpora*.

To try and play politics and to lobby is unlikely to be effective in the face of authoritarian policies of Governments whose minds are made up. It is only likely to harm rather than to enhance the reputation of Classics by making us appear only to want not so much to preserve the *status quo* as to put the clock back even as far as compulsory Latin if not Greek. Our model might be Departments of Hebrew, Egyptology and Oriental Studies, and our chief duty to preserve the Classics in their pure form in such academic monasteries as we may be able to retreat to, rather than to dilute them. Let by all means those of us who feel the call and are capable of it sally forth on missionary journeys, but let us not call it Classics.

The Editor is well aware that the rhetorical training that a classical education used to provide has somewhat carried him away, but he allows the end of the last paragraph to stand though conscious of its exaggeration. Last month's number contained a further article in which recommendations for the present were disguised as history of the past (a very Roman historical technique). To this debate *LCM*'s contributions will be and are two. The plain speaking of an Editor who has little or nothing to lose by it, and the publication of the kind of research which people want to do.


What this proposal might mean in the practice of departments is a concentration on the teaching of the languages and the provision of information (not opinions) about the ancient world, while leaving it to students to familiarize themselves with the whole corpus of ancient literature, some of it in translation, and themselves to read works of criticism before discussing them with us. The Editor has noticed a degree of optimism about the

amount of Greek or Latin from scratch that students can be expected to assimilate in three years. His own experience does not bear this out. After the necessary grammatical slog of the first year he believes that the best method is the old-fashioned one of 'reading with pupils' as much as is possible in what might be a longer and harder day. Scientists with whom he has spoken believe that the first duty of Classics Departments is indeed to teach the languages, and might be as horrified as is the Editor to realize just how much our students rely on translations and dictated critical opinions.

Time to cut the cackle, or whatever noise it is that dinosaurs are conjectured to have made. Readers may have noticed some differences in the last few numbers (apart from their being late, that is). This is because they have been produced using a new programme, QuarkXpress™, which gives results superior to those produced by WriteNow™ and which makes it easier to deal with page make-up. Some of the articles in this and in the previous number were received on disc, and the Editor does encourage more contributors to submit articles in this form, on 3.5" or 5.25" discs: Macintosh users should send copy in Microsoft Word, WriteNow, Macwrite or ASCII ("Text only") format or even already in Xpress. IBM users may send 5.25" discs in ASCII, ProDOS or DCA-RFT format. Discs should however be accompanied by a printout. But it will take some time for the typography finally to settle down, and the Editor is toying with the idea of putting two columns on a page.

He must also inform those readers and especially contributors who may feel moved to ring up and ask what has happened to their articles that the University telephone system is changing on October 8th, and that from ~~that date~~ he can be dialled direct on 051-794-2448: so can LCM, which will be moving from the Editor's room to the basement where printing is already carried on, and where the Editorial Assistant, often a more reliable source of information than the Editor, can be reached, also ~~from that date~~, on 051-794-2455.

The dates of the Colloquium on '19th century Classical Scholarship in English' have now been fixed at Wednesday 16th to Sunday 20th August 1989 and full details will be sent to inquirers. The main programme is fixed and will include papers by, among others, Professors Arnott on Walter Headlam, Collard on F.A. Paley and Jocelyn on W.M. Lindsay, but offers of shorter (20 min.) informal discussion papers are invited.

The dinosaur seems to be evolving to a more efficient, even mammalian mode, but will not abandon his image, nor his longwindedness. 

A. James Cullens (Otago): *A recalculation of the number of grain recipients in the late Republic*

LCM 13.7 (Jul.1988), 98-99

In this note it is my intention first to bring to light an error in R. J. Rowland's calculations of the number of grain recipients in the Late Republic¹. Secondly, I intend to show that Rowland's incorrect figures have been used in standard works by subsequent scholars, who it seems have not checked his calculations thoroughly.

In his article Rowland has attempted to work out the number of people that were eligible to receive benefits under the *Lex Terentia et Cassia frumentaria*. Through an error in calculation he arrives at a figure of approximately 180,000 recipients, instead of about 110,000. Rowland works from the following data in Cicero, *Verrines* II. 3. 163:

frumentum emere in Sicilia debuit Verres ex senatus consulto et ex lege Terentia et Cassia frumentaria. emundi duo genera fuerunt, unum decumanum, alterum quod praeterea civitatibus aequaliter esset distributum; illius decumani tantum quantum ex primis decumis fuisset, huius imperati in annos singulos tritici mod. DCCC; pretium autem constitutum decumano in modios singulos HS III, imperato HS III S. ita in frumentum imperatum HS duodetriciens in annos singulos Verri decernebatur quod aratoribus solveret, in alteras decumanas fere ad nonagiens.²

Nearly 9,000,000 *sesterces* will purchase roughly 3,000,000 *modii* of corn at a price of three *sesterces* a *modius*. Cicero tells us that the second tithe equals the first tithe, so their combined total is nearly 6,000,000 *modii*. If we add to this the 800,000 *modii* for the *frumentum imperatum*, we arrive at Rowland's figure of approximately 6,500,000 *modii* for the total amount of Sicilian grain purchased under the terms of the *Lex Terentia et Cassia frumentaria*.

If we divide the total of 6,500,000 *modii* by five *modii* (to represent the grain ration of an eligible person

¹ R. J. Rowland Jnr. 'The number of grain recipients in the late Republic', *Acta Antiqua Hung.* XIII (1965), pp. 81-83.

² Cicero, *Verrines* II.3.163 (translation adapted from L. H. G. Greenwood, Loeb 1935): 'It was Verres' duty according to a decree of the senate, and according to the provisions of the corn law of the year of Terentius and Cassius, to purchase corn in Sicily. There were two kinds of purchase to be carried out, the first of a tithe, the second an additional purchase to be distributed fairly among the various communities. The amount of the former was to be the same as that yielded by the original tithes; that of the latter the "requisitioned" corn - was to be 800,000 *modii* each year. The price fixed for the tithe corn was three *sesterces* a *modius*, and three and a half *sesterces* a *modius* for the requisitioned corn'. Verres was therefore assigned 2,800,000 *sesterces* a year to pay the farmers for the requisitioned corn, and about 9,000,000 a year to pay for the second tithe.

per month) and then by twelve (representing the number of months in a year), we arrive at a figure which represents the number of people that could be fed five *modii* a month for twelve months from the total amount of Sicilian grain purchased under the Terentian-Cassian law. Rather than the 180,000 that Rowland arrived at, the correct figure is 108,333 recurring, or approximately 110,000 recipients.

Unfortunately Rowland's incorrect figure appears in G. Rickman's standard work, *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*³, who it seems has not checked the calculation.

In late 63 or early 62 B.C., M. Porcius Cato instigated the passing of a *senatus consultum* which in some way increased the number of citizens receiving state-owned grain at a reduced price. There are two references to Cato's actions in Plutarch. Firstly in the *Life of Cato*, . . . ὁ Κάτων φοβηθεὶς ἔπεισε τὴν βουλὴν ἀναλαβεῖν τὸν ἄπορον καὶ ἀνέμητον ὄχλον εἰς τὸ σιτηρέσιον, ἀναλώματος μὲν ὄντος ἑνιαυτοῦ χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα ταλάντων, . . . ⁴. Here Plutarch is specifically stating that 1250 talents was the total annual expenditure on grain. This figure of 1250 talents is equal to 7,500,000 drachmas.

The second reference in Plutarch is in the *Life of Caesar*, διὸ καὶ Κάτων . . . ἔπεισε τὴν σύγκλητον ἀπονεῖμαι σιτηρέσιον αὐτοῖς ἔμμηνον, ἐξ οὗ δαπάνης μὲν ἐπτακόσιοι πεντήκοντα μυριάδες ἑνιαύσιοι προσεγίνοντο τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναλώμασι, . . . ⁵. Here Plutarch refers to the amount that Cato's action caused to be added to the other state expenditures. This figure of 7,500,000 drachmas is the same as the figure that Plutarch gives for the total annual expenditure on grain. Clearly there is a problem with these figures as they cannot be one and the same. However, there is a solution.

As Rowland correctly observes, since Plutarch informs us that the total annual expenditure on grain distribution was 1250 talents after Cato's proposal, and that Cato added an annual sum of 7,500,000 drachmas to the other state expenditures, the two figures cannot represent both the total expenditure and the new additional expenditure, since 1250 talents is the same as 7,500,000 drachmas. There are three leading manuscripts⁶, of which only two concern us, since the other one derives its life of Caesar from another place⁷. All of the standard texts⁸ ignore the best manuscript (L), which reads 5,500,000 drachmas. Of the other manuscript (P) Garzetti⁹ gives no comment. The figure in the *Vita Catonis* for the total expenditure has been used to correct the text of Plutarch's *Vita Caesaris*¹⁰. To do this is both illegitimate and misleading since the *Vita Caesaris* is specifically stating the additional expenditure incurred after Cato's proposal.

Rowland has correctly equated 5,500,000 drachmas with 5,500,000 *denarii*, as Plutarch uses the drachma as the Greek translation of *denarius*. Since one *denarius* is equal to four *sesterces*, 22,000,000 *HS* purchases 5,500,000 *modii* of grain (at 4 *HS* a *modius* in Sicily). The 5,500,000 *modii* of grain is then divided by five *modii*, (representing the grain ration of an eligible person per month) and by twelve, (for the number of months in a year). The result is approximately 90,000. Since Rowland has added this 90,000 to his incorrect figure of 180,000 grain recipients in the period 73-63 B.C., he arrives at 270,000 for the total after 63 B.C.. Instead, we must add 90,000 to the correct figure of 110,000, so producing 200,000 as the number of people receiving state-owned grain at a reduced price in 62 B.C.

Claude Nicolet¹¹ noticed the first of Rowland's errors, and made the correction from 180,000 to 108,000 recipients under the *Lex Terentia et Cassia*. However, he then gives a range of 108,000 to 270,000 recipients¹² for the number of people eligible under the *senatus consultum* of 63-62 B.C. As we have seen, this is wrong, and 200,000 is the correct maximum figure.

Thus as far as our evidence from Plutarch and Cicero goes, the number of recipients of state-owned grain under the *Lex Terentia et Cassia* of 73 B.C. was about 110,000 people, with an additional 90,000 people under the terms of the *senatus consultum* of 63-62 B.C., taking the total number of recipients to about 200,000.

Copyright © 1988 A. James Cullens

³ Clarendon Press, Oxford 1980, p.168.

⁴ Plutarch, *Cat. Min.* 26. 1; (Translation from Loeb, B. Perrin, 1919): 'Cato was therefore alarmed and persuaded the senate to conciliate the poor and landless multitude by including them in the distribution of grain, the annual expenditure for which was twelve hundred and fifty talents.'

⁵ Plutarch, *Caes.* 8.4 (Translation from Loeb, B. Perrin, 1919): 'It was for this reason, too, that Cato, persuaded the senate to assign them a monthly allowance of grain, in consequence of which an annual outlay of 7,500,000 drachmas was added to the other expenditures of the state.'

⁶ See Lindskog and Ziegler edition of Plutarch's *Lives*, II. 1, (Teubner 1932), p.vii.

⁷ A. Garzetti, *Plutarchi Vita Caesaris*, Firenze, 1954, p. LV.

⁸ Teubner, Vol. II. Fasc. 2 : ed. Konrat Ziegler, Leipzig, 1935; Budé : ed. R. Flacelière and E. Chambry, Paris, 1975; *Plutarchi Vita Caesaris* : ed. A. Garzetti, Firenze, 1954.

⁹ Garzetti, *op.cit.* p. L.

¹⁰ Garzetti, *op.cit.* p.27.

¹¹ C. Nicolet, *Le métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine*, Paris, 1976, p.262, note 1.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 263.

Sarah Donaldson (St Andrews): '*Direness*' and its place in the *Aeneid*

LCM 13.7 (Jul. 1988), 100-101

The thesis of this article is that any mention of *dirae*, or of any case or gender of the adjective, can carry the same emotional charge, and provoke the same emotional response, as *Dirae*. It is important to remember that in the original MS there would not have been the distinguishing capital letter, and both noun and adjective would have appeared as *dirae*, with the meaning to be understood from the context, not as in a modern text which makes each word exclusive in its situation, with no possible blurring between noun and adjective, concept and manifestation. As it is possible to take both aspects together grammatically, it is necessary to see whether the rather vague nature of the *Dirae* is reflected in the Vergilian use of *dirus*. I argue that it is.

The capital letter for *dirae* is used four times in Mynors' 1969 *Oxford Classical Text* of the *Aeneid*, but this does not rule out all the other instances when a manifestation of *natura Dirarum* is presented in a concrete form. For how is one to take the references to Allecto at 7.324 and 454? It would therefore seem to be more useful to categorize the functions of the types of manifestation of '*direness*' than to try and divide the occurrences into things seen and recognized as *Dirae* – with all the traditional paraphernalia of snakes, whips and torches – and things felt internally as *dirum* or manifested in the human or natural sphere of comprehension. All aspects, I would suggest, carry the same emotional charge of awe and fear, and an awareness of inexorable power and the mysterious workings of Fate or Doom. There should be no clear distinction made between the visible and tangible and what is only felt or experienced internally.

How then is '*direness*' manifested? I first list all the occurrences of the word in the *Aeneid*.

- 1.293 *dirae* . . . | *Belli portae*
- 2.261 *dirus Ulixes*
- 519 *quae mens tam dira* . . . | *impulit his cingi telis?*
- 622 *dira facies* (of the gods destroying Troy)
- 762 *dirus Ulixes*
- 3.211 *dira Celaeno*
- 228 *tum vox taetrum dira inter odorem*
- 235 *dira* . . . *gente* (Harpies)
- 256 *dira fames*
- 262 *sive deae seu sint dirae obscaeque volucres* (Harpies)
- 593 *dira inluyes immissaque barba* (of Achaemenides)
- 713 *dira Celaeno*
- 4.473 *ultrices* . . . *Dirae* (Dido's dream)
- 563 *dolos dirumque nefas*
- 6.373 *tam dira cupido* (of Palinurus)
- 498 *dira* . . . *supplicia* (of Deiphobus in Hades)
- 721 *tam dira cupido* (of souls for rebirth)
- 7. 22 *litora dira* (Circe's island)
- 324 *dirarum* . . . *dearum* (Allecto)
- 454 *dirarum ab sede sororum* (Allecto)
- 520 *qua bucina signum | dira dedit*
- 8.194 *facies tam dira* (of Cacus)
- 235 *dirarum* . . . *volucrum* (around Cacus' cave)
- 349 *religio | dira loci* (numinosity of the Capitol)
- 701 *Dirae* (on Aeneas' shield)
- 9.185 *an sua cuique deus fit dira cupido*
- 11 56 *nec sospite dirum | optabis nato funus pater* (that of Pallas)
- 217 *dirum execrantur bellum Turnique hymenaeos*
- 237 *dira meorum | supplicia* (the metamorphosis of Diomedes' followers)
- 792 *dira pestis* (Arruns' description of Camilla)
- 12.845 *Dirae* (sent to attack and unnerve Turnus)
- 869 *Dirae* (sent to warn off Juturna)
- 914 *dea dira negat* (see 845)
- 924 *exitium dirum hasta ferens* (for Turnus).

From this list of occurrences it is possible to work out some sort of pattern for the use of the word. It can be seen as the nature of something that is so imbued with it that it becomes the dominant strain (rather like the action of a virus), as *dirus Ulixes* (twice in Book 2) or *dira Celaeno* (twice in Book 3). These instances, along

with the mention of *ultrices dirae* at 4.473 and Allecto's appearances in Book 7, form the most obvious part of the visible aspect of this 'direness'. The other side of this aspect is where it works from within as an insidious force, leading to its victim's acting in a way, or taking a decision, that will ultimately lead to destruction, as Priam at 2.519 or Nisus at 9.185. These are the most obvious aspects of the concept, but they are not the most powerful: the most compelling is the idea of a fated punishment for a 'crime' however obscure, such as the *dira supplicia* of Diomedes' followers, who were turned into birds, and Diomedes' own exile for waging war against the gods (but note in passing the change in tone between the fate of Homer's Diomedes, who is merely warned off, and that of Vergil's, who is actually punished: there is a general darkening of tone, just as the Greeks euphemistically called the Furies Eumenides, 'The Kindly Ones' while Vergil calls them Dirae, 'The Awe-ful Ones').

It is here that the Dirae are shown to be at their most powerful, because they are a force and not an entity. This form of punishment can be visited in the most subtle manner; often there is the feeling of the unfathomable workings of Fate, or of something even deeper, a primordial force that bides its time before striking. This must be recognized when it is asked why a seemingly innocent victim should be so stricken, such as Achaemenides (3.593) or Pallas, whose funeral is described in 11.56 as *dirum*: but it often seems to be the case that like madness (cf. the cult of the *Μανία* on the way from Megalopolis to Messene, Pausanias 8.34.1 *καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὰς τὰς θεὰς καὶ τὴν χώραν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν Μανίας· δοκεῖν δέ μοι θεῶν τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἔστιν ἐπὶ κλησίς, καὶ Ὀρέστην ἐπὶ τῷ φόβῳ τῆς μητρὸς φασὶν αὐτόθι μανῆναι*, and the Roman title Furiae, *Aen.* 3.252, 6.605, 8.669, cf. *Lucr.* 3.1011 & *Cic. ND* 3.46) or disease what happens is caused by a contagious miasma, of which the effects, like these pollutions, could be communicated, so that Achaemenides' squalor seemed *dirum* to Aeneas and Pallas' funeral to Evander.

It seems to be part of the poetic and dramatic ethos that the workings of fate should be mysterious, but also inescapable. This is well explained in M. I. Finley's evaluation of Oedipus (*Aspects of Antiquity*, London 1968, p.3), where he says that '... he curses his fate not because it was unjust or because he regretted having done what he might have avoided, ... but because his fate *was* to do terrible things'. It is therefore not the place of the poet to try and explain the seeming lack of guilt, it is merely part of the cosmic order of things that is beyond the comprehension of man, but it is observed by him in its workings.

It is then possible to see that, despite its many occurrences, all the mentions of 'direness' carry something of a common nature: something with 'religious' overtones in that it stems from Fate or Doom and is either present in a visible and tangible form or is experienced from within, and something that will achieve its end in its own time, so that man is left wondering at its victim. It is also the case that the apparent differences in the use of *dirus*, *Dirae* and all the other cases cannot be so clearly differentiated as their grammar or modern typographical conventions would lead one to believe.

Copyright © 1988 Sarah Donaldson

G. B. A. Fletcher (Newcastle): *Siliana*

LCM 13.7 (Jul. 1988), 101-105

1.19 *recludere mentes*. Tac. *Ann.* 6.6 *recludantur* ... *mentes*

1.32 *propius metuens*. Koch conjectured *propriis*. Bauer compares 17.535 *propius sperans ingentia*. A. T. Lindblom, *In Silii Italici Punica Quaestiones*, Upsala 1906, p.119, compares 4.772 *propior metus*, 16.512 *propioribus* ... *stimulis*, and Virg. *A.* 8.556-7 *propiusque periclo* | *it timor*. Cf. *Luc.* 10.47 *propius timere larissas*.

1.58 *improba uirtus*. Stat. *Theb.* 4.319.

1.125 *late consterni milite campos*. Virg. *A.* 12.543 *late terram consternere tergo*.

1.140 *arcano pectore*. *Luc.* 2.285, Stat. *Theb.* 1.246.

1.146 *Baeticolasque uiros furiis agitabat iniquis*. Livy 29.18.15 *omnibus eos agitare furiis*, Ovid *M.* 6.595 *furiis agitata doloris*. Schrader conjectured *frenis*, Chory *furtis*.

1.224 *ualli festinat opus*. Cf. Sen. *Apoc.* 4.1 *sponte sua festinat opus*.

1.411 *exarmare ueneno*. Calp. *Sic.* 5.94 *obtusio iacet exarmata ueneno*, Stat. *Theb.* 11.743 *iam piger et longo iacet exarmatus ab aeuo*.

1.484-5 *fer debita fraudum* | *praemia et Italiam tellure inquire sub ima*. Murrus urges Hannibal to 'look to Italy'. A. Ker, *PCPhS* ns.13 (1967), p.15, says "the word *inquire* will not do: *inquirō* always elsewhere seems to mean 'to look into' or 'investigate', until we come to the Christian writers", and he conjectures *require*. Cf. Pacuvius *tr.* 219-20 R.² (232-3 W.) *te*, Sol, *inuoco*, | *inquirendi ut mei parentis mihi potestatem dūis*, Livy 22.7.5 *Flamini quoque corpus funeris causa magna cum cura inquisitum non inuenit*, 25.31.10 *aegre id Marcellum tulisse sepulturaeque curam habitam et propinquis iam inquisitis honori praesidioque nomen ac memoriam eius fuisse*, 30.27.12 *placuit* ... *homines ubique inquiri*, Sen. *Contr.* 10.1.2 *non desinam inquirere percussorem et fortasse iam inueni*, Sen. *Phaedra* 1278-9 *per agros corporis partes uagas inquirite*.

- 1.614 *dexteraque a curuis capulo non segnis aratris*. *a* means 'owing to'. Cf., for example, 2.139, 4.252, 11.99, 15.291, and 16.435 mistranslated by Duff.
- 1.615 *exiguo faciles*. Tac. *H*.1.79.4 *facilis lorica*.
2. 21 *caede calentibus*. Lucr. 3.643 and 5.1313 *permixta caede calentes*.
- 2.125 *illa uolans humerum rapido transuerberat ictu*. Bothe conjectured *rabido*. Cf. 1.360.
- 2.382 *non ultra patiens . . . rexisse dolorem*. Luc. 3.377 *patiens longo munimine cingi*.
- 2.557 *clara genus*. Tac. *Ann*.6.9.3 *clari genus*.
- 2.678 *rapiens letum*. Luc. 4.345 *rapiendo . . . leto*.
- 3.72 *aegra timoris*, 13.52 *aeger delicti*. Luc. 7.240 *aeger . . . morae*.
- 3.87 *gloria partus*. Mart. 12.21.7.
- 3.92 *sudatus labor*. Stat. *Theb*.5.189
- 3.160 *crebro . . . obit omnia uisu*. Virg. *A*.10.467 *obit . . . truci . . . omnia uisu*.
- 3.179-80 *si quid inest animo par fortibus ausis | fer gressus agiles mecum*. Burman conjectured *animi* and took *par* to be not neuter but masculine. He did not quote Virg. *A*.9.281-2 *me nulla dies tam fortibus ausis | dissimilem arguerit*.
- 3.183 *dextram iniectare*. Luc. 3.611 *iniectare manum*.
- 3.387 *iussis parere magistris*. Duff translates 'obey the commands of the rider' as if *magistri*, conjectured by Dausqueius, were in the text. Cf. for example, Livy 1.22.1 *Tullum Hostilium . . . regem populus iussit*, Ovid *M*.11.591 *iussi regis*, Luc. 7.79 *duce te iusso*.
- 4.43-4 *non et rerum curas consultaque belli | stare probat*. Virg. *A*.12.814 *pro uita maiora audere probauit*.
- 4.110 *noui . . . sanguinis ardor*. Stat. *Theb*.4.546-7 *ardor | sanguinis adfusi*.
- 4.165 *taetros e sanguine rores*. Ruperti quotes Virg. *A*.12.339-40 *spargit . . . rores | sanguineos* but not Luc. 9.698 *diros . . . de sanguine rores*.
- 4.274 *medio stetit aequore pugna*. Prop. 3.3.43-4 *aut quibus in campis Mariano proelia signo | stent*.
- 4.348 *fonte quieto*. For the use of *fons* with the meaning of 'stream' L.Håkanson, *Silius Italicus, kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen*, Lund 1976, p.12, quotes 4.639. Cf. also Luc. 3.235.
- 4.363 *bellis . . . subactis*. Ruperti conjectured *subacti*. Cf. Calp. Sic. 1.52 *subigentur . . . bella*.
- 4.536 *citāt . . . hastam*. Bentley conjectured *rotat*. Ruperti quotes 9.592-3 *citato | ense* and Stat. *Theb*. 8.125 *arma citat*. Cf. Stat. *A*. 2.132 *gaesa citent*.
- 4.715 *uentorum tenet ipse uicem*. Sen. *Ben*.6.38.1 *impium uotum sceleris uicem tenuit*.
- 4.777 *suspirat . . . Bacchum*. Luc. 6.370 *uentos suspirat*.
- 5.76 *fatis superi certare minores*. Editors quote Hor. *Sat*.2.3.313 *tanto certare minorem*. P. G. W. Glare's *Oxford Latin Dictionary* quotes *ille . . . disco bonus . . . , nec caestu bellare minor* as Stat. *Theb*.6.816. That line is *uincis, abi; pulchrum uitam donare minori*. The true reference is 6.828-9.
- 5.136 *pandebat hiatus*. Cf. 10.295, Sen. *Oed*.164-5.
- 5.533-4 *cessata . . . tempora*. Ovid *M*.10.699.
- 5.555-6 *uirtute feroci exultare*. Virg. *A*.12.19-20 *feroci | uirtute exsuperas*.
- 5.558 *accensus in iram*. Luc. 3.133 *in iram . . . accensus*.
- 5.589 *te . . . properato funere carpsit*. Bentley conjectured *mersit*. Bauer compared 13.626-7 *te . . . | . . . funere carpsit*, which Duff translates 'laid you in the grave'. In the present passage Duff translates 'cut off'. Cf. Stat. *Theb*.11.184 *quorum tot gaudia carpsi*. Germ. *Aratea* 259 *carpitur una*.
6. 20-21 *nec . . . redemit plus aevi*. Luc. 9.981 *populis donas mortalibus aeuum*.
- 6.27 *necis certus*. Stat. *Theb*.7.699.
- 6.48 *ferrique uicem deus praebuit irae*. Ovid *M*.12.381 *saeuique uicem praestantia teli*.
- 6.81 *nimius uitae*. Cf. Stat. *Silu*.5.3.252-3 *non indignus aevi, | non nimius*.
- 6.121 *praeceps . . . rota uoluitur aevi*. Cf. Sen. *HF*.180-1 *rota praecipitis uertitur anni*.
- 6.177-8 *mixtam stridore procellam Cerbereo*. Duff wrongly translates 'the baying of Cerberus'. The Didot translation rightly has '*sifflements digne de Cerbère*'. For the adjective with this meaning of 'like that of Cerberus' cf. Ovid *M*.14.65 *Cerbereos rictus*.
- 6.188 *metu . . . anhelī*. Val. Fl. 4.514 *leti . . . metu propioris anhelae*, Stat. *A*. 1.488 *anhela metu*.
- 6.285 *resonae . . . ripae*. Luc. 7.480 *resonis . . . uallibus*.
- 6.359 *aspera ponti*. Manil. 4.678 *Euxini . . . aspera ponti*, Tac. *Ann*.4.6.4 *asperis maris*.
- 6.402 *inuidiam caelo diuisque ferebat*. Tac. *H*.3.39.1 *inuidiam ferret*.
- 6.564-5 *remeantum . . . | seruat turba gradus*. Virg. *A*.2.711 *longo seruat uestigia coniunx*.
- 6.614 *blando . . . gloria fuco*. Ovid *F*.1.103 *perfusa . . . gloria fuco*.
- 7.191 *dulcis odoratis humor sudauit ab uuis*. Virg. *G*.2.118-9 *quid tibi odorato referam sudantia ligno | balsama*.
- 7.209 *it monti decus*. Bauer cites Val. Fl. 4.216-7 *mox omnibus idem | ibit honos*. Cf. Ovid *AA*.3.428 *in . . .*

nurus Parthas dedecus illud eat, Sen. *HO* 1970 *luctus in turpes eat*, Stat. *Theb.* 6.722-3 *uictori tigrim inanem | ire iubet*.

7.291-2 *degener . . . | belligeri ritus*. Plin. *NH* 5.45 *degeneres . . . humani ritus*.

7.299 *sonipes strato . . . dorso*. Ruperti conjectured *stricto* or *strictus* with *loro*. Cf. 16.164-6 *stratum . . . ostro . . . cornipedem*, Livy 37.20.4 *non stratos . . . equos*.

7.322 *ceruice reposta*. Lucr. 1.35.

7.526-7 *accendere sagaces . . . curas*. Livy 28.46.12 *curam ingentem accendit patribus*.

7.645 *leuibus . . . gyris*. Gronovius conjectured *breuibus*. Cf. Stat. *Silu.* 5.2.121 *gyro leuiore*.

8.26 *ad spes armorum et furialia uota reducit*. *furialia uota* is said in P. G. W. Glare's *Oxford Latin Dictionary* to mean 'prayers invoking the Furies'. The words mean 'insane ambition'. Cf., for example, Ovid *M.* 6.84 and 11.2 *furialibus ausis*.

8.52 *festinat . . . pyram*. Duff translates 'she hastened . . . to the . . . pyre'. Drakenborch quotes Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.128-9 *uestes . . . | festinabat*. Cf. also Ovid *M.* 11.575 *festinat uestes*.

8.212 *cura aegrescente*. Stat. *Theb.* 1.400 *aegrescit cura*.

8.294 *numerare parentem Assaracum . . . praestabat*. Luc. 5.228-30 *nullum bellum sentire fragorem | . . . praestare deorum | excepta quis morte potest*.

8.470-1 *illusa . . . | tauro Pasiphae*. Duff translates 'Pasiphae whom the bull deceived'. Write rather 'whom the bull seduced'.

8.637 *rubuit letale cometes*. Stat. *Theb.* 12.760 *letale furens*.

9.150 *absoluo pater ipse manum*. Sen. *Oed.* 662-3 *sospes absoluit manus Polybus meas*.

9.231 *eatus*. For the meaning 'bank' compare Ovid *F* 1.501 with Håkanson, op. cit., p.22.

9.314 *insanus . . . ensis*. Drakenborch quotes Germ. *Aratea* 112 *nondum uesanos rabies nudauerat enses*. Cf. Calp. *Sic.* 1.59 *insanos . . . enses*, Stat. *Theb.* 10.32 *insanis . . . armis*.

10. 79 *tacito . . . premens uestigia rostro*. Ruperti quotes Sen. *Thy.* 500-1 *tacito locum rostro pererrat*. Cf. Luc. 4.442-3 *presso uestigia rostro | colligit*.

10.139 *maximus aevi*. Luc. 1.585 *maximus aevo*.

10.153 *dubitantia lumina*. Heinsius quotes 10.457 *dubia ceruice*. Cf. Stat. *Theb.* 8.756 *lumina . . . dubitantia*.

10.176 *antiqua tumentem nomina*. Cf. Virg. *A.* 11.854 *uana tumentem*, Sil. 17.429, Stat. *Theb.* 8.429 *magnum et gentile tumentes*. In the present passage Lindblom, op. cit., p.127, conjectures *tonantem*, comparing Virg. *A.* 12.529-30 *antiqua sonantem | nomina*.

10.323 *naufragium spargens operit freta*. For *naufragium* meaning 'wreckage' cf. Manil. 5.435 *maris praedas et rapta profundo naufragia*.

10.393-4 *aegra metu*. Tac. *Ann.* 12.51.3 *timore aeger*.

10.469 *proiectus membra*. Heinsius conjectured *proiectus* or *proreptus*. Cf. *Culex* 158 *proiectus membra*.

10.490-1 *mansuescere corda | nescia*. Virg. *G.* 4.470 *nescia . . . mansuescere corda*.

10.540-1 *solam pauitantibus arcem | sperauisse sat est*. Ker, op. cit., p.21, knows no example later than Plautus of *sperare* in this sense, seen in *deos sperare*, and he alters the accusative to the ablative. Cf. Tac. *H.* 4.76.2 *Germanos qui ab ipsis sperentur*.

11.9 *leuis . . . sero pressurus facta pudore*. Duff translates 'a fickle folk whose late repentance was to avert their doom'. The words *pressurus facta* mean 'suppress the memory of what they did'. Cf. Virg. *A.* 12.322 *pressa est insignis gloria facti*, Ovid *P.* 1.4.26 *si modo non uerum nomina magna premunt*.

11.47 For *senectus* meaning 'old men', which Silius has also in 16.665, cf. Ovid *Ep.* 14.109-10 and Luc. 2.232-3.

11.91 *sedes . . . belli uiduata procella*. Cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.385 *uiduare penates*.

11.224 *irarum . . . procellas*. Stat. *Theb.* 7.536 *uaria . . . animum turbante procella*.

11.264 *frenata acies*. Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.47 *frenatae . . . alae*.

11.439 *mollissima mensae*. For *mensa* so used cf. Grat. 398 and Sen. *HF* 759.

11.482 *pectora . . . frangebat carmine*. Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.194 *Aeaciden . . . frangebat carmine*.

11.598 *enses non reddere perstat*. Stat. *Silu.* 2.3.73 *Iliacos aequare senes, . . . persta*.

12. 28 *non spreta uigoris*. Tac. *Ann.* 14.40.2 *neque morum spernendus*.

12 31 *molles urbi ritus*. Plin. *NH* 2.190 *ritus molles*.

12.39 *inglorius ausi*. Tac. *H.* 3.59.2 *inglorius militiae*.

12.50 *famae . . . pudore futurae*. Cic. *De Prouinc. Cons.* 14 *famae pudor*.

12.245-6 *uiolata . . . ceruix | marmoreum in iugulum collo labente recumbit*. Ker, op. cit., p.25, remarks that *ceruix recumbit* means 'his head sinks' 'as it appears to mean at Ov. *M.* 10.195 *ceruix umero recumbit*'. For this meaning of *ceruix* cf. Sil. 13.373, Luc. 8.12 and 8.674.

12.264 *sitiens . . . hasta*. Stat. *Theb.* 12.750 *hasta . . . sitiebat uulnera*.

12.424 *parcior ira*. Ovid *P.* 1.2.96 *paene etiam merito parcior ira mea est*.

- 12.438-9 *se . . . aequor irrumpit*. Varro *Men.* 411 *irrumpit se in curiam*.
 12.451 *dum procul Oebalios amet expugnare nepotes*. Duff's translation 'while he was far away, trying to take their town from the descendants of Oebalus' cannot be right. Ker, op. cit., p.25, conjectures *auet*, which was conjectured by Wolf in 1522 and is recorded by Ruperti and attributed to Nicander by Bauer.
 12.496 *curas . . . corde fatigant*. Stat. *Silu.* 5.1.8 *curas . . . fatigat*, A.1.104-5 *coepta fatigat | pectore consilia*.
 12.619 *fluit agmen aquarum*. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *CQ* 53 (1959), p.177, says '*fluere* does not seem to be used elsewhere of rain' and he therefore conjectures *pluit*. Conjecture is not called for. Cf. Ovid *P.* 4.4.2 *fluat imber* and Sen. *NQ.* 3.28.2 *fluere assiduos imbres*.
 12.646 *pressere silentia*. Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.64 *pressere silentia*, Apul. *M.* 4.19.2 *premens obnixum silentium*.
 12.692 *aegram . . . curis*. Virg. A.1.208 *curis . . . aeger*.
 13.113 *saeuis . . . terroribus*. Virg. A.2.559 *saeuus . . . horror*.
 13.126-7 *felix . . . senectam . . . duxisse*. Virg. A.9.772-3 *quo non felicius alter | unguere tela*.
 13.153 *uox attigit (accidit Drakenborch) aures*. Cf. Varro in Nonius 263 M.(402 L.) *quem . . . Roman uenisse mi adtigit aures nuntius*.
 13.168 *strictum . . . detegit ense*. Burman conjectured *deripit*. Cf. Luc. 3.128 *detege iam ferrum*.
 13.256 *non in requiem pariter cessere tenebrae*. Cf. Livy 4.44.9 *ne qua largitio cessura in trium gratiam tribunorum fieret*, Sen. *Ep.* 78.3 *in remedium cedunt honesta solacia*.
 13.336 *in praeruptum . . . prona . . . cautes*. Livy 4.59.4 *urbs prona in paludes*.
 13.384 *Scipiadas, magnumque decus magnumque dolorem*. Virg. A.10.507 *o dolor atque decus magnum rediture parenti*.
 13.399 *noscere uenturos agitat mens protinus annos*. Virg. A.9.186-7 *pugnam aut aliquid iamdudum inuadere magnum | mens agitat mihi*.
 13.429-30 *operto | . . . regi*. Luc. 6.515 *arcana . . . Ditis operti*.
 13.550 *laxata . . . nocte*. Stat. *Silu.* 5.1.256 *laxare tenebras*, Theb. 12.254 *nigrantes laxabant astra tenebras*.
 13.719 *appellare uiros erat ardor*. Stat. *Theb.* 1.440-1 *ardor | exturbare odiis tranquilla silentia*.
 14.70 *Aeolio regnatas nomine terras*. Ovid *Ep.* 2.112 *nomine femineo uix satis apta regi*.
 14.92-3 *uillissima regi cura pudor*. Cf. Quint. 11.1.30 *uillis pudor*.
 14.375-6 *uasto ad proelia nisu | incumbunt proni*. Virg. A.8.236 *prona iugo laeuum incumbibat ad amnem*.
 14.396 *diuis in uota vocatis*. Virg. A.7.471 *diuos . . . in uota uocauit*.
 14.448 *flammis . . . ouantibus*. Virg. A.10.409 *flammas ouantes*.
 14.475 D. R. Shackleton Bailey, op. cit., p.179, attributes to Heinsius the conjecture *desiuit* which Bauer rightly attributes to Blass.
 14.538 *ignauum . . . remum*. Heinsius conjectured *ignarum*. Cf. Virg. *G.* 2.208 *nemora . . . ignaua*.
 15.29 *stans uultus*. Drakenborch quotes Luc. 5.214 *stat numquam facies* and Stat. *Theb.* 10.693 *stant tua lumina*. Cf. Livy 39.34.7 *ut non uultus ei constaret*.
 15.253 *pariter pariterque*. Cf. Ovid *M.* 15.183 and Mart. 12.17.3.
 15.277-8 *Mycenaeus . . . traxit in aequora proras | rector*. Ker, op. cit., p.28, conjectures *Mycenaeas*, which was conjectured centuries ago, refuted by Drakenborch and mentioned by Ruperti.
 15.319 *nec legem regno accepisse refugit*. Sen. *Ag.* 417 *refugit loqui mens aegra*.
 15.411 *fratris spirans ingentia facta*. Cf. 3.240 *fratrem spirat in armis*, Stat. *Silu.* 4.6.94-5 *Vestinus . . . , quem nocte dieque | spirat*, Livy 3.46.2 *inquietum hominem et tribunatum etiam nunc spirantem*.
 15.425-6 *aurata puerum rapiebat ad aethera penna | per nubes aquila, intexto librata uolatu*. Duff translates the last three words by 'with outspread wings'. Write rather 'poised in pictured flight'.
 16.68 *murum miseris ruit*. For *murus* of a person Barth quotes Ovid *M.* 13.281. Cf. *Inc. trag.* 69 and Sen. *Tro.* 126.
 16.268-9 *sine ullo delapsa attactu*. Virg. A.7.349-50.
 16.496 *leui nisu postremoque agmine*. Lucr. 4.906 *leui nisu*, Manil. 5.79-80 *prima tenentem agmina*.
 16.517 *gemina . . . palma*. Virg. A.5.339 *tertia palma*, Sil. 16.573.
 16.604-5 *satiatus et aevi | et decoris*. Ovid *M.* 7.808-9 *satiata ferinae | dextera caedis*.
 17.313 *luctantem uana*. Ovid *F.* 4.583 *uana labores*.
 17.429 *uana tumentem*. Virg. A.11.584.
 17.535 *propius sperans ingentia*. Livy 1.47.7 *ingentia pollicendo*, Luc. 6.796 *ausos . . . ingentia*.
 17.550 *tantumne obstat mea gloria diuis*. Cf. Virg. A.6.64-5 *dique deaeque omnes quibus obstitit Ilium et ingens | gloria Dardaniae*.

Housman has written in vain for Duff at 5.5, 6.277, 8.624, 10.568, 12.65 and 17.652. There is some carelessness in Duff's work, which includes repetition of misprints in Bauer's text at 1.33 *conanime*, 2.221, 3.675, 6.214 & 269, 9.379, 13.664, 16.515 *conanima*. In his introduction he says that the English translation by Thomas Ross, with a preface dated at Bruges, November 18, 1657, was published in London in 1672, twelve years

after the Restoration. It was published in London in 1661.

There is also some carelessness in Ker's work. He devotes the last page of his paper to a list of passages which have not yet, as far as he knows, been correctly translated. At 2.466 & 705, 6.538, 8.323 and 13.444 Duff is in error but the translations given by Ker are the same as those given by Bothe, whom he miscalls Boethe, and in the Didot edition. At 7.470 and 12.237 Duff is in error but the Didot edition is not. At 2.533, 8.405 and 17.72 Duff is in error but Bothe is not.

Silius uses more than a hundred adjectives with a genitive. Of these the following are not recorded with a genitive in any author in P. G. W. Glare's *Oxford Latin Dictionary*: *ardens*, *despectus*, *erectus*, *flauus*, *maximus*, *mutabilis*, *siccus*, *uigil*. Similarly *fiducia* with an infinitive (1.591), *laetor* with an infinitive (9.503-4 and 12.313) and *deformis* with an accusative and infinitive (7.59-60) are unrecorded.

Copyright 1988 G. B. A. Fletcher.

Niall W. Slater (The Center for Hellenic Studies): *The τειχίον of Ecclesiazusae 497*. LCM 13.7 (Jul.1988) 105

When the women of the chorus of *Ecclesiazusae* return from the assembly, they are still wearing their male disguises. At 496-97, they propose some movement prior to disrobing: ἀλλ' εἴα δεῦρ' ἐπὶ σκιᾷ ἐλθοῦσα πρὸς τὸ τειχίον... What is this wall?

R. G. Ussher in his edition of the play (Oxford 1973) ad loc takes this to be the wall of Praxagora's house. Note, however, that the women of the chorus are naturally in the orchestra. The wall of Praxagora's house is set back from the orchestra by the width of the stage. While we do not know the precise width of this stage, it seems clear that the chorus would not be in the shadow of the backdrop wall without ascending to the stage.

C. Anti (*Teatri Grece Arcaici da Minosse a Pericle* [Padua 1947] 242-43) suggested that this was an actual wall ('*muricciuolo meridionale*') in the Lenaeon theatre. Ussher rejects this view, and Anti's site for the Lenaion has been generally discounted (in favor of another possible site, see my 'The Lenaeon Theatre', *ZPE* 66 [1986] 255-64). In the absence of didascalic information, we have no proof that this is a Lenaeon play, though Ussher himself ad 416 takes the references to winter-like cold as a possible indication that the play was Lenaeon.

Any non-imaginary wall must border on space accessible to the chorus. I suggest that πρὸς τὸ τειχίον is a reference to the front edge of the stage and therefore an indication that the stage of this period (both in the Theatre of Dionysos and the Lenaeon Theatre) was sufficiently raised and cut off from the orchestra to function as a wall. Note that this stage need not be more than three or four feet high, though calling it a wall does argue against any steps running the width of the stage front. The women leave their clothes and beards here; in fact, we need not even imagine stagehands clearing these things away, as they would not impede the chorus in any activity in the orchestra and would, under the shadow of the edge of the stage, be nearly invisible.

The controversy over the height of the stage in the fifth and early fourth centuries is endless. For the most recent work, see F. E. Winter, 'The Stage of New Comedy', *Phoenix* 37 (1983) 38-47, and Rhys F. Townsend, 'The Fourth Century Theatre of Dionysos', *Hesperia* 55 (1986) 421-438.

Copyright © 1988 Niall W. Slater

Dana Ferrin Sutton (U. Cal. Irvine): *Dicaeopolis as Aristophanes*,
Aristophanes as Dicaeopolis

LCM 13.7 (Jul. 1988), 105-108

Increasingly, modern literary criticism is focussing on the frequent self-referential nature of Aristophanic comedy. As one recent writer puts it¹:

... I shall look especially ... at theatrical self-reference, or 'metatheatre' – at the ways in which plays may, or may not, draw attention to their own 'playness', to the fact that they are artifices being performed under special controlled circumstances. Clearly the nature and degree of self-reference has great bearing on the relation of the world of the play to that audience. Old comedy is ubiquitously self-referential: Aristophanes is probably the most metatheatrical playwright before Pirandello. The world of the audience is never safe from invasion, even appropriation, by the world of the play.

A fine example of Aristophanic metatheatrics is the Euripides scene in the *Acharnians*. Dicaeopolis is nearly lynched by the chorus of Acharnian farmers. To stop them, he picks up a charcoal-basket and threatens to stab it with a sword if they do not desist. As the Scholiast notices, he is playing out a scene from Euripides' *Telephus*. Then, faced with the need of winning the chorus (explicitly identified as such at line 416) over to his side, he

¹ Oliver Taplin, 'Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis', *JHS* 106 (1986), 164.

goes to Euripides' house, and with the poet's help sorts through various beggar-costumes before donning the rags of Telephus as a means of gaining their sympathy. In so doing, he manages to generate a lot of humor based on Euripides' frequent use of squalid characters, his greengrocer mother, and the other-worldliness and pretentiousness of his life-style².

In the course of this scene reference is made to the *eccyclema* on which Euripides makes his entrance (408f.). At one point the chorus steps flagrantly out of character to make a joke at the expense of the hirsute tragedian-dithyrambist Hieronymus (389f.). Aristophanes interweaves such elements as tragic parody, ridicule of two tragic poets, a reminder that the Acharnians are in fact a comic chorus, mention of stage machinery, the discussion of theatrical costume, use of a prop (the chopping block), even an onstage costume change. Both verbally and visually, he goes out of his way to emphasize that we are in the artificial environment of a play.

Another element makes the metatheatrical humor of this scene more complex. At 377ff. Dicaeopolis says:

αὐτός τ' ἐμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον
ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρσι κωμῳδίαν.
εἰσελκύσας γάρ μ' εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον
διέβαλλε καὶ ψευδῇ κατεγλώττιζέ μου
κάκυκλοβόρει κάπλυνεν, ὥστ' ὀλίγου πάνυ
ἀπωλόμην μολυσπραγμοσύμενος.
νῦν οὖν με πρῶτον πρὶν λέγειν ἐάσατε
ἐνσκευάσασθαι μ' οἶον ἀθλιώτατον.

And at 497ff. he begins his monologue:

μή μοι φθοιῇσατ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν
μέλλω περὶ τῆς πόλεως, τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν.
τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγῳδία.
ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μέν, δίκαια δέ.
οὐ γάρ με νῦν διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι
ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω.
αὐτοὶ γάρ ἐσμεν οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγῶν,
κοῦπω ξένοι πάρεισιν· οὔτε γὰρ φόροι
ἤκουσιν οὔτ' ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι·
ἀλλ' ἐσμεν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιπτισμένοι.

In the former passage, the speaker momentarily becomes Aristophanes himself. The same thing happens at 497ff., in a somewhat more complicated way: Although the speaker clearly is Aristophanes, something of Dicaeopolis is evidently retained, as is indicated by the words *πτωχὸς ὢν* he is still playing Dicaeopolis' Telephus-role. Hence at 377ff. we may say that Dicaeopolis is momentarily replaced by Aristophanes. However, in the latter passage it would be more accurate to speak of a temporary fusion of Dicaeopolis and Aristophanes, in which the latter predominates. At the same time, we may observe that the theme of metadrama is carried forward in both passages. Dramatic illusion is temporarily ruptured as the playwright speaks out in both his own words, and in the second passage we are frankly reminded that this is a comedy, performed at the Attic Lenaea. The audience is addressed as such, and is given a reminder that the world of reality can react to – and retaliate against – the make-believe world of the stage.

The technique employed in these two passages, whereby the author momentarily casts aside a character's persona and speaks to the audience in his own words, is unique in extant Aristophanic comedy³.

² At 410f., when Dicaeopolis exclaims to Euripides *ἀναβάδην ποιεῖς* | *ἐξὸν καταβάδην*, the primary reference is to the physical staging of the play. But there is probably a symbolic value as well: 'You act like a *Luftmensch*, when you could just as well be down-to-earth'. And the airs put on Euripides' slave Cephisophon of course reflect on his own pretentiousness.

³ In fr.488 Kassel-Austin (*Skenas Katalambanousae*), a trimeter fragment, the poet speaks of his handling of Euripides. Kassel-Austin suggest the technique may be the same as in the *Acharnians*. Or could Aristophanes have made himself a stage-character, as Cratinus once did? *Vita Aristophanis* XXVIII.61, p.136 Koster, quotes fr.604 K.-A., in which the speaker complains of his wife and two sons, as the poet's own words. But this may be one of those instances in which a biographical interpretation is placed on a passage in later antiquity, especially as some sources state that Aristophanes had three sons (cf. my discussion at *AJP* 108 [1987], 20f.).

For this reason, modern commentators are not agreed on the significance of these lines. K. J. Dover, for example, is clearly uncomfortable⁴:

Here it seems to be the individual character . . . who is speaking on the poet's behalf; possibly we should think rather of Dikaiopolis as the comic 'hero' appearing (like Charlie Chaplin) in many different years under different names and in different situations, but if we do we must not overlook the fact that the verb in the expression I have uneasily translated as 'doing comedy', [τρογυψιδαν ποιῶν], is the verb regularly used of the writer.

Kenneth McLeish raises interpretative questions⁵:

Is [the actor] speaking here as Dikaiopolis or Aristophanes (or both)? Does the whole of his speech retain the same character? If not, where does it change? If it does – if, for example, he speaks as Aristophanes throughout – is not the political commentary that follows surprisingly selective, naive, inept? Would it not be best, in short, to take the passage as no more Aristophanes' own true voice than [Peace 765ff.].

At a later point in the book, the same writer takes a somewhat different attitude⁶:

The most notable use of this 'stepping-aside' technique is Dikaiopolis' central speech in *Acharnians* . . . where the duality between the actor performing in the plot and the actor observing his own performance allows Aristophanes to keep the political commentary light and humorous . . .

Kenneth Reckford is not troubled by the questions that occur to McLeish⁷:

Out of the confusion of roles – a confusion that shapes Dicaeopolis speech in a playful manner, calling attention, like his costume, to the elements of disguise, pretense, and make-believe – emerges the persona of the honest comic poet, defending his own integrity . . . The beggar is now Aristophanes, his subject is the polis, his audience is – the audience.

Quotations such as these go to show that there is no consensus among Aristophanic scholars about how these lines are to be taken. There is no agreement about the relation of the persona of Aristophanes to that of Dicaeopolis in the long speech beginning at 497. There is no discussion – although Reckford hints at an awareness that this is an issue – of the relation of the metatheatrical humor in 497ff. to the heavy use of such humor throughout the preceding Euripides scene

When Aristophanes speaks to the audience through Dicaeopolis' mouth, what is in fact happening? Our understanding of these two passages, and of their relation to the metatheatrical humor that dominates this portion of the play, would be significantly advanced if we were to assume that the actor playing Dicaeopolis was Aristophanes himself.

We need not be disturbed by the fact that there is only one dubious item of evidence for Aristophanes acting⁸, since it was normal for playwrights to act in their own plays. The leading modern student of ancient acting and actors, Paulette Ghiron-Bistagne, has speculated that several Aristophanic roles were performed by the playwright himself, including Dicaeopolis in *Acharnians* although this suggestion was made without reference to 377ff. and 497ff.⁹

The question that ought to be asked about these two passages is why Aristophanes adopts this technique of confusing the persona of the playwright for that of the character at this point in the play. The reason is that much of the metatheatrical humor of *Acharnians* is generated by drawing attention to theatrical role-playing. In this part of the play we have a character-as-actor, when Dicaeopolis plays the role of Telephus, but only after rummaging through a series of other tragic personae that he could just as well have adopted. In a sense, we have character-as-playwright when Dicaeopolis picks up the charcoal-basket and momentarily creates his own melodrama. We also have actor-as-playwright, in the form of a stage-Euripides. We are reminded that the Acharnian farmers are in fact a comic chorus. So we are in an environment where we are specially aware of the issue of dramatic personae, which can be put on, discarded, set askew.

⁴Aristophanic Comedy (Berkeley 1972), 58

⁵The Theatre of Aristophanes (London 1980), 57.

⁶Ib. 88.

⁷Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy (Chapel Hill - London 1987), 181.

⁸According to the Scholiast on *Knights* 230, he played Creon in that play. This tradition is accepted by P. Ghiron-Bistagne, *Recherches sur les Acteurs dans la Grèce Antique* (Paris 1976), 148, but is rejected as an inference from the text by John Bartholemew O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece together with a Prosopographia Histrionum Graecorum* (Chicago 1980). As we shall see, if Aristophanes did play Dicaeopolis, there is a strong argument that he in fact played the Sausage-Seller in *Knights*.

⁹Loc. cit.

In this context it suits Aristophanes' comic purpose to draw attention to a further issue of artificial personae: if we can have character-as-actor, and character-as-playwright, we can equally well have actor-as-character, playwright-as-actor, and playwright-as-character. So by explicitly reminding the audience that he is the actor playing Dicaeopolis, Aristophanes completes the circle of possibilities. In the extended speech beginning at 497 we are faced with the spectacle of a playwright-actor playing a character who is in turn an actor, dressed in a Telephus costume and delivering a speech that is in some sense a parody of the long defense-speech in Euripides' *Telephus*, a speech the hero makes with his head on the block (fr.709N.²) – complicated stuff indeed! This is the way that allowing Dicaeopolis' mask to slip and the audience a glimpse of his own face behind it serves to complicate and enrich the metatheatrical humor of the entire sequence. This suggestion raises two further issues. First, the objection might be raised that this interpretation is only valid according to the further assumption that the audience was aware that Aristophanes himself was playing the lead role in the play: given the use of identity-disguising masks, is this assumption safe? In point of fact, however, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that an ancient audience could be perfectly aware of the identity of actors. In the middle of the 5th century B.C. an actors' competition was established. Such a competition would make small sense if masks and costumes completely concealed actors' identities. Then too, the interesting suggestion has recently been made¹⁰ that in Greek tragedy artistic capital was made of the fact that the audience could perceive that different parts were played by the same actor. Hence the theory that the audience would know that Aristophanes was playing the role of Dicaeopolis does not require any great stretch of the imagination¹¹.

Second, if we assume that Aristophanes played Dicaeopolis, can we extrapolate any conclusion about his function as an actor in other plays? It would be intolerably rash to leap to the conclusion that the poet always, or even usually, played the lead roles in his plays. But it is probably safe to suggest that the roles of Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians* and the Sausage-seller in the *Knights* were played by the same actor. McLeish has pointed out¹² the similar demands placed on the actor by these two roles, quite different from those made on the actors who play the lead roles in other Aristophanic comedies. Both are required to speak a long monologue, and this would require considerable oratorical skill to hold the audience's attention. Slapstick or other forms of physical exertion are restricted to the first and last scenes of the play. Neither part required important singing passages. Hence McLeish may well be right in suggesting that both roles were written for the same actor; if this actor was Aristophanes himself, then the ancient tradition that he played Cleon in the *Knights* can be set aside.

Copyright © 1988 Dana Ferrin Sutton.

Review: F. W. Walbank (Peterhouse, Cambridge)

LCM13.7 (Jul. 1988), 108-112

Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (edd.), *Hellenism in the East: the interaction of Greek and non-Greek civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, London, Duckworth, 1987. Pp.xvi + 192; 14 plates, 1 map, 12 figs. Cloth, £28.00. ISBN 07-156-21254

Hellenismus, Hellenism – the word (as Fergus Millar reminds us in this book) goes back not just to Droysen, but to 2 Macc.4.13, where it refers to the 'Hellenization' of Jerusalem. There remains something uncomfortable about it, though it can hardly be dispensed with in any attempt to describe life within the vast area of the middle east, with its many cultural traditions, throughout the three centuries from Alexander to Augustus. 'What does it mean?', asked Tarn: and answered: 'To one, a new culture compounded of Greek and oriental elements; to another, the extension of Greek culture to Orientals; to another, the continuation of the pure line of the older Greek civilization; to yet another, the same civilization modified by new conditions'. All of them, he claimed, contain a truth, yet none is the whole truth – and all are unworkable when one comes down to details. What partial compromise each scholar opts for will depend largely on the evidence available at the time and the importance he or she attaches to various bits of it. The book under review is revisionist, at times aggressively so. It claims that for the Seleucid kingdom, at any rate, the legacy from Assyria, Babylonia and the Achaemenids counted for far more than has hitherto been realized and that its character can best be understood if one sees it in a context going back to those civilizations and forward, not merely or even primarily to Rome, but rather to the 'caricatured' Parthians and the Mauryans. In fact, we have been getting it all wrong: the real heart of the Seleucid empire was not in Antioch or Seleucia/Orontes but in Babylonia.

¹⁰ By John Gould, *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge U.K. 1985) 275.

¹¹ At this point, it will be objected that the play was produced by Callistratus – so how would the audience know that Aristophanes was the author? At the very least, the theory advanced here makes this old problem no worse than it was before, and possibly mitigates it. In any event, I suspect that when an Old Comedy poet produced a play under someone else's name, this was a transparent ruse that fooled nobody.

¹² *Op.cit.* 122f..

In the course of her cogent analysis of the work of Berossus (chapter 2) one of the editors, Amélie Kuhrt (AK), quotes Oswyn Murray's observation that the rejection of statements by earlier historians form a standard element of Hellenistic historiography 'whereby earlier writers on the subject were discredited in order to emphasize the author's own superior knowledge and access to relevant records'. Just occasionally one gets a whiff of this *topos* in the present volume – as when, for instance, we are told that a shifting of focus to the middle east would prove 'a fruitful method for re-evaluating the dynamics of the Seleucid empire in a way that has been singularly lacking in past treatments and has been profitably applied in the following chapters'. But in saying this the reviewer is perhaps being harsh, for the book does undoubtedly use new material from the Persian Gulf, Mesopotamia, Afghanistan (especially, of course, Ai Khanoum) and India together with many cuneiform texts, only recently made available, to very good effect. The result is that our attention is drawn away from the Greco-Macedonian conquerors to the concerns of some of the conquered peoples and the policies of the rulers are seen in a new perspective. New ground is broken and hints emerge for a fresh synthesis in the future.

The volume opens with an unsigned preface, presumably by Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White, the two editors, which serves as an introduction and a manifesto. It is followed by six chapters based on papers presented to a seminar on *The Seleucid Empire: Sources and Problems*, which was held in the Institute of Classical Studies, London, in autumn 1984. All six are of high quality, well written and documented and supported with useful cross-references. There is a comprehensive bibliography and an excellent index. The editing is generally satisfactory, though, as Simon Hornblower observes in the *Times Literary Supplement* (April 1-7, 1988), a major contradiction between Millar and Colledge on the importance or even existence of Hellenistic theatres in Syria has been left unresolved. On the main issues there is general consensus among the six contributors – though Fergus Millar is taken gently, but firmly, to task in the preface on the grounds that the material he examines concerning Greeks and Macedonians in Hellenistic Syria 'is susceptible to a more positive interpretation than he himself allows'. To bring out the strengths and occasional weaknesses of the book I will discuss the six chapters in succession.

1. The introductory chapter by Susan Sherwin-White (SS-W) on Seleucid Babylonia argues for a 'strong' view of the Seleucids against the 'weak' view preferred by Will, Musti and the present reviewer. When one grants the importance which they merit to Bactria and Sogdiana (pp.16-17), SS-W argues, Babylonia clearly stands out as the heart of the Seleucid empire; and its kings recognized that fact in their special concern for the religion and prosperity of its inhabitants. According to Christian Habicht (*Vierteljahrschrift für Soziologie und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 45 [1958], 1-16), who based his figures on a sample of about 250 names, Syrians, Jews, Persians and other Iranians were excluded from the bureaucracy which ran the Seleucid empire and even in later years men of these origins never amounted to more than 2.5% of the whole (the exceptions being mainly commanders of bodies of native troops). Since then new material has been published, particularly from Babylonian cuneiform tablets, which modifies this picture; and SS-W somewhat combatively dismisses Habicht's figures as 'worthless'. That surely is an exaggeration. It is the size of a sample, not its relation to the size of the whole which is being investigated, that determines its validity; and, even when one allows for the Greco-Macedonian bias of most of the sources from which Habicht's figures are taken, a ratio of 97.5 : 2.5 must tell us *something* about the monopoly of power by the conquering race. Something – though, I confess, not perhaps as much as one might hope or suppose, since as R. J. van der Spek (RJVS) emphasizes, nomenclature can be a tricky business. There were many men in Babylonia with Greek names – but Babylonian relatives; and the customs in nomenclature which this reveals (pp.68-70) can easily be paralleled from Egypt where Greek and Egyptian names are found within a single family. Which one a man uses appears often to depend on the post he holds; see for example the interesting case of Menches, the *kōmogrammateus* of the Fayum village of Kerkeosiris, who is now known from a demotic document to have been 'a Greek born in in Egypt' (whatever that may mean) and to have belonged to a thoroughly Hellenized family (W.Clarysse, *Aegyptus* 65 [1985], 59-60). It seems highly probable, however, that, as in Egypt, the lower ranks in the Seleucid administration will have been filled by members of the native population. That was no doubt especially true in Babylonia, where in cities like Babylon and Uruk such civil administration as we can detect seems hardly distinguishable from the temple administration – which would of course favour the holding of positions by native Babylonians.

How far this new material should modify the racial balance suggested by Habicht's figures for the bureaucracy is another matter. But SS-W is not wholly impartial in discussing this question. For instance, in adducing a 'new piece of evidence' in a decree from Amyzon (published by the Roberts in 1983), in which the Macedonian satrap Asander proposes an Iranian as *neōkoros* of the sanctuary of Artemis and sponsors citizenship of Amyzon for him and his family, she claims not merely that this contradicts the idea that the Successors excluded 'non-Greeks' from official positions, but that it actually attests an 'opposite trend'. But a single example cannot attest a trend (contrast Habicht's 250 cases which are 'statistically worthless'); and when that example is the action taken by a satrap of Caria in 321 it can tell us nothing about the policy later to be adopted in the Seleucid empire, which did not yet exist at that date.

Nevertheless SS-W makes a number of telling points, in response to which the present reviewer will not be alone, I think, in crying '*touché*'. She shows, for instance, that Greek was not used exclusively as the official language, though the exceptions she quotes do not challenge the supremacy of Greek as the language used exclusively at high levels and in all inter-state communications; after all, the Successors and *their* successors were Greek-speaking Macedonians. She also insists, correctly, that the Seleucids, like other Hellenistic royal houses, made a substantial use of dynastic alliances with all kinds of non-Greek rulers to further their diplomatic ends (the statement to the contrary in my *Hellenistic World*, p.125, is untrue and should be corrected accordingly).

On two important matters SS-W takes up a new position. The first concerns the tradition that Alexander courted the goodwill of the Babylonians by rebuilding the temple of Esagila, which Xerxes has destroyed; the reference in our sources to that destruction she rejects. The same view is taken by AK (who has, indeed, written a joint article with SS-W on the subject in H.W.A.M. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt, ed., *Achaemenid History II: the sources*, Leiden 1987). SS-W merely refers to previous scholars' misunderstanding of Herodotus 1.183, 'the unique primary source'. AK (p.49) mentions Arrian 3.16.4, but only for Alexander's rebuilding of the sanctuary; and her statement that the temple was still standing in 331 appears to rest on the fact that there is no Babylonian evidence to the contrary. I must confess to some unease, however, at this cavalier treatment of Arrian's clear statement (3.16.4) that Xerxes destroyed Esagila. SS-W also rejects the statements in Pliny (*NH* 6.122) and Pausanias (1.16.3) that Babylon was (partially at least) denuded to populate Seleucia/Tigris. The continuing importance of Babylon is also emphasized by RJVS, who draws attention to the retrospective dating of the opening of the Seleucid Era to the capture of Babylon in 311. This is of course true for the Babylonian dating, but not for the Greek; and in any case the capture of Babylon gave Seleucus control of the whole province of Babylonia and it may have been the territorial base that this success gave him that is reflected in the new era rather than the acquisition of the city. How far Babylonia remained central to Seleucid ambitions is a separate matter which I will discuss below.

Finally, SS-W has an important discussion of the Akkadian Dynastic Prophecy (A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* [1975], no.10), of which she prints a translation (pp.12-14). This text favours the Achaemenids and is hostile to Alexander and the Macedonians. SS-W argues plausibly that it is intended as an appeal to the Seleucids to exercise good rule; but I am not convinced that it necessarily follows from that that the 'prophecy' is designed to encourage a 'new Babylonian kingdom' and is evidence for a Babylonianizing of Seleucid policies.

2. Amélie Kuhrt (AK) touches on some of the same topics by way of a still more problematic document, the *Babyloniaka* of Berossus. Our concept of this fragmentary work has been bedevilled by the 'astronomical passages' which have come down to us under his name. AK argues convincingly that these are the work of a pseudepigrapher, who has tried to attach a spurious 'oriental' authority to a number of ideas wholly Greek in character and origin by attributing them to the historian; hence they are to be disregarded in any assessment of Berossus. Arnaldo Momigliano (*Alien Wisdom* [1975], 148) had a pertinent comment on a general disposition of the Hellenistic world to 'admire its own forgeries as manifestations of a foreign civilization'; on AK's reckoning pseudo-Berossus falls fairly into that category. She argues that the real Berossus wrote within a cultural context which arose indirectly as a result of the Babylonians having surrendered to Alexander (as indeed they had surrendered to earlier conquerors). This they had done not from dislike of Persia and not with enthusiasm either, but simply following what had become a traditional reaction to any threat with which they could not cope militarily. It was some compensation for them that their conqueror conceded that their surrender in turn laid certain obligations upon him – in particular to look after the temples. It was as a response to that obligation that the restoration of Esagila by Alexander was significant. AK believes that the cultural context to which I have referred developed out of this relationship and came to full maturity in the outstanding and racially sensitive reign of Antiochus I. But the evidence offered in support of the picture of a stable and economically prosperous Babylonia sustained by the personal involvement and patronage of the second Seleucid – the cylinder from Borsippa, offerings to the moon-god at Ur and grants of land to Babylonian cities, together with (under later rulers!) the celebration of the New Year festival at Babylon and temple building at Uruk and elsewhere – seems to me to add up to no more than what one would expect from a newly-established dynasty anxious to keep on the right side of powerful temple authorities. It is consistent with the picture AK seeks to draw, but as *proof* of its correctness I find it rather meagre.

There have been many attempts to understand what Berossus was getting at; AK summarizes these. For herself she argues (following an idea of W. W. Tarn) that his history was intended to offer ideological support to the Seleucids, rather as Hecataeus of Abdera gave support to Ptolemy I. In the prominence of their role, Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar II were perhaps to be seen as forerunners of Seleucus I and Antiochus I, outbidding, as it were, Hecataeus' picture of Sesostris III. It is an ingenious and suggestive theory which may well be right. All in all, this is an impressive chapter, which uses a wide range of material to excellent effect. The reader will note the observation (in the preface, p.xi) that further study of Megasthenes, who portrayed Nebuchadnezzar II as a world-conqueror, is a desideratum for middle-eastern history in the Hellenistic period.

3. In his chapter on the Babylonian city R. J. van der Spek (RJVS) makes good use of the cuneiform tablets. This is especially useful since the greater part of those from the British Museum which have been recently published still stand in need of transliteration, translation and comment before they can be assessed and used by scholars in other fields. An interesting fact which emerges from RJVS's discussion is that in both Babylon and Uruk the administration of the temples seems to be closely linked with that of the city, the same individuals being responsible for both civic and religious affairs. Thus in Babylon we read of 'the deputy of Nicanor . . . acting along with that *shatammu* and the council [of the temple]', and this is the only body operating in the civic field too. Who Nicanor was we do not know, nor whether his name (which is common) indicates a Greek or a Hellenized Iranian or Babylonian. In both Babylonian and Uruk officials are mentioned with Babylonian names, the *pāhātu* in the former, the *saknu* and *paqdu* in the latter. There is no indication of the Greek equivalent of these terms (if indeed there was one).

RJVS draws attention to important fiscal changes which took place in Babylonia c.274/3. After that date sales of slaves or arable land are no longer recorded on cuneiform documents, but (cf. SS-W p.27) have to be registered with the *chreophylax*. SS-W explains this as fiscal consolidation carried out in the second generation of the dynasty. But RJVS connects it with Greek colonization at Uruk. It is hard to judge, but if he is right this reform does not go very well with the theory of SS-W and AK about the Babylonia-centred policy of the early Seleucids. I mention this point here as an example of the tenuous and sometimes contradictory evidence on which theories are – perhaps inevitably – made to rest, and the need for great caution in using this evidence. What does emerge clearly is that Babylonia was only superficially Hellenized and that there was little racial mixing.

4. J.F.Salles (JFS), who has excavated for the French in Kuwait, contributes an exciting chapter on Seleucid involvement in the areas in and around the Persian Gulf. Evidence from here is rather patchy and generally the result of chance surface finds rather than systematic excavation, which has been rare. For modern political reasons the south side of the Gulf has been and still is more accessible than the north. The main areas discussed by JFS are (a) the island of Bahrain (ancient Tyllis); (b) the eastern, Hasa province of Saudi Arabia, where the author approves Potts' proposal to identify Thaj, a place containing substantial ancient remains, with the important trading city of Gerrha, visited by Antiochus III in 205 and the probable site of the mint which, between 280 and 210, emitted two series of coins known from a hoard published in 1972 by Mørkholm; and (c) the island of Failaka (ancient Icarus). Throughout the third and the first half of the second centuries the Gulf seems to have prospered, with a high point (judging by the number of coin-finds) under Antiochus III. JFS suggests that, following their predecessors, the early Seleucids controlled the Gulf as far as the Straits of Hormuz. He approves the view that there was a Seleucid fleet stationed in the Gulf, and suggests that there were several putting-in sites where the ships could get an overhaul. There will also have been a military presence, probably centred on Failaka, where the Greek community may in fact have been a royal garrison, since the letter of Anaxarchus (recorded on one of the inscriptions found there) is addressed simply to the *oiketai* on the island; there is nothing to suggest any more formal organization as a *polis* or a *katoikia*. The prosperity of the area will have derived partly from the cross-desert trade coming via Gerrha; but for Bahrain JFS postulates an economy similar to that prevailing there for centuries, viz. small men practising date-farming and pearl-fishing, with the trade organized by a local aristocracy. This all sounds very plausible, and one would dearly like to know more. But the author stresses that at present it must rank simply as a likely hypothesis. One can challenge individual items, but by and large one can only be grateful for the new material recorded and hope that conditions will soon allow work in this area to be resumed. A caveat should, however, be entered concerning the map on p.101, which puts Larisa, Chalcis and Arethusa firmly at sites along the coast just north of Bahrain (Tyllis). Even though the map is labelled 'tentative' this may well lead an unwary reader to suppose that we actually know where these places are.

5. Fergus Millar (FM)'s chapter on an area usually regarded as better known is in some ways the most revolutionary in the book. The main problem for Hellenistic Syria (defined by FM as the territory between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean) is to determine the character of the cities, and to decide how far Hellenization had gone and how far it was imposed from above. After stressing the tenuousness of our evidence – see, for instance, p.117 for the extremely meagre crop of inscriptions available for this period from Antioch, Seleucia/Pieria and Apamea – FM points out that it is only in the region around Antioch that one can prove that the Seleucids brought a real transformation. Our ignorance about Hellenization is matched by our ignorance about land tenure and labour relations. On both those topics we are of course better informed for Asia Minor, but even there the relevant inscriptions create many problems. And when, as in the Scythopolis dossier, we have information about Palestine, it reveals a very complicated bureaucratic system, which it is dangerous to try to apply to other areas. One point, which is revealed very clearly in two Ptolemaic ordinances of 260, dealing with the registration of livestock and *natives* in Syria and Phoenicia (Austin 273), is the vulnerability of native populations to apparently arbitrary enslavement.

Whether the native population fared better under the Seleucids after Panion we do not know. As FM points

out, in Syria the main interest of the latter seems to have centred on raising taxes and troops (these via the Greek cities or local dynasts). The reaction of the cities in the area is revealed in a crop of requests (the ones we know of were of course granted) for *asylia* and exemption from billeting. As regards Hellenization, this, FM claims, had little to do with Seleucid policy. It is rather to be seen as an evolutionary process beginning long before the Hellenistic epoch and appearing first in the coastal cities. Samaria and Judaea resisted the alien influence for some time; as for cities like Damascus, we are frankly in ignorance. To read Nicolaus one would judge Damascus to be a purely Greek city, which cannot be right. In so far as there is a truly mixed culture it seems to appear first on the periphery of the areas controlled by the later Seleucids and then Rome, finding expression in the form of building and the use of inscriptions in north-east Arabia, among the Nabateans, in Palmyra and in the Hauran (Djebel Druze) south of Damascus. There is no continuity from the period before Alexander through to the great days at Baalbeck and Emesa later on. If FM is right about this, the Hellenization of the Near East must be seen in a long perspective in which the policies of Alexander and his Seleucid successors play a much less prominent role than is usually assumed; and the old theory, generally thought little of nowadays, of *Hellenismus* as a mixed culture, gains some rather unexpected support from the fringe areas.

6 This concept of a mixed culture also crops up again in the last chapter, by M. Colledge (MC), on art and architecture. Here too there are problems. The Hellenization which FM traces in the coastal cities of Mediterranean Syria finds expression in the style of building and town-planning, in the monuments, in the coinage and in gems. But what that means socially we cannot say, since a Greco-Macedonian ruling class could be expected to hire Greek artists. At Ai Khanoum on the other hand we find a temple of Mesopotamian fashion and a palace which mixes Greek and Achaemenid styles. Does that point to a Babylonian architect? The picture continues into the later period with different styles juxtaposed. And increasingly examples of a hybrid style are to be found, which correspond to the mixed culture seen by FM as coming in from the periphery. From about 50 B. C. the Greek element diminishes.

To sum up, this book neither claims to give nor in fact gives a single, consistent, novel picture of the Hellenistic world. What it does give in ample measure is a survey of the new evidence which has been accumulating in recent decades and its deployment in a new perspective which changes the received version at several points. It also suggests new solutions to many of the old problems, such as the definition of *Hellenismus*. It is perhaps most successful where it is most tentative. The present reviewer feels least happy with the claim that Babylonia was the heart of the Seleucid empire. Vitally important, yes, if only by reason of its geographical position at the nerve-centre of the empire; but once Ipsus had given Seleucus access to the Mediterranean he was quick to develop the area in the corner around Antioch and Seleucia/Pieria with Greek cities, so that the whole district became known as Seleucis (cf. *OGIS* 229 1.2). However great their concern for Babylonia and Persia and lands still further to the east the Seleucids did not forget that they were Macedonian kings. As regards Antiochus I's supposed warm and sensitive relationship with the Babylonians, either this has been exaggerated or it did not last. That is clear from the well-known absence of both native Syrians and Babylonians from the Seleucid army on the only three occasions when we can study it at close quarters – at Raphia, at Magnesia and on the occasion of Antiochus IV's great festival at Daphne. This absence is best explained as the outcome of a continuing distrust of the loyalty of these peoples rather than as an expression of contempt for their martial skill. The struggle for power against Antigonos and later against the Ptolemies, their rivals for Coele-Syria and its important coastland, ensured that when Seleucus shared power with his son, the later Antiochus I, it was the east, not the west, which he put under him. But provided we see them as a widening, and not as a *bouleversement* of our notions of what the Seleucid empire was seeking to achieve, the new information and the new vistas contained in this volume deserve the warmest welcome. Indeed one can scarcely do other than applaud Simon Hornblower's dictum, that this is 'one of the most important contributions to ancient history in recent years'.

